Quantum steerability: characterization, quantification, superactivation and unbounded amplification

Chung-Yun Hsieh[1], Yeong-Cherng Liang[2], and Ray-Kuang Lee[1,3]
[1] *Department of Physics, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu 300, Taiwan*
[2] *Department of Physics, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan 701, Taiwan*
[3] *Physics Division, National Center for Theoretical Science, Hsinchu 300, Taiwan*
(Dated: September 27, 2016)

Quantum steering, also called Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering, is the intriguing phenomenon associated with the ability of spatially separated observers to *steer*—by means of local measurements—the set of conditional quantum states accessible by a distant party. In the light of quantum information, *all* steerable quantum states are known to be resources for quantum information processing tasks. Here, via a quantity dubbed *steering fraction*, we derive a simple, but general criterion that allows one to identify quantum states that can exhibit quantum steering, thus making an important step towards the characterization of steerable quantum states. The criterion, in turn, also provides an upper bound on the largest steering-inequality violation achievable by arbitrary finite-dimensional maximally entangled states. For the quantification of steerability, we prove that a strengthened version of the steering fraction is a *convex steering monotone* and demonstrate how it is related to two other steering monotones, namely, steerable weight and steering robustness. Using these tools, we provide an explicit demonstration of the *superactivation* of steerability for a well-known family of entangled quantum states, i.e., we demonstrate how the steerability of certain entangled, but unsteerable quantum states can be recovered by allowing joint measurements on multiple copies of the same state. Finally, we prove that for an arbitrarily small amount of steering-inequality *violation*, there exists steerable quantum state whose steering-inequality violation can be arbitrarily amplified by allowing joint measurement on as little as three copies of the same state. For completeness, we also demonstrate how the largest steering-inequality violation can be used to bound the largest Bell-inequality violation and derive a sufficient condition for Bell-nonlocality from the latter.

arXiv:1609.07581v1 [quant-ph] 24 Sep 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

From the famous Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) paradox [1] to Bell's seminal discovery [2], quantum theory has never failed to surprise us with its plethora of intriguing phenomena and mind-boggling applications [3, 4]. Among those who made the bizarre nature of quantum theory evident was Schrödinger, who not only coined the term "entanglement", but also pointed out that quantum theory allows for *steering* [5]: through the act of local measurements on one-half of an entangled state, a party can *remotely* steer the set of (conditional) quantum states accessible by the other party.

Taking a quantum information perspective, the demonstration of steering can be viewed as the verification of entanglement involving an untrusted party [6]. Imagine that two parties Alice and Bob share some quantum state and Alice wants to convince Bob that the shared state is entangled, but Bob does not trust her. If Alice can convince Bob that the shared state indeed exhibits EPR steering, then Bob would be convinced that they share entanglement, as the latter is a prerequisite for steering. Note, however, that shared entanglement is generally insufficient to guarantee steerability. Interestingly, steerability is actually a necessary but generally insufficient condition for the demonstration of Bell-nonlocality [6, 7]. Hence, steering represents a form of quantum inseparability in between entanglement and Bell-nonlocality.

Apart from entanglement verification in a partially-trusted scenario, steering has also found applications in the distribution of secret keys in partially trusted scenario [8]. From a resource perspective, the steerability of a quantum state ρ, i.e, whether ρ is steerable and the extent to which it can exhibit steering turns out to provide also an indication for the usefulness of ρ in other quantum information processing tasks. For instance, steerability as quantified by steering robustness [9] is monotonously related to the probability of success in the problem of subchannel discrimination when one is restricted to local measurements aided by one-way communications. The characterization of quantum states that are capable of exhibiting steering and the quantification of steerability are thus of relevance not just from a fundamental viewpoint, but also in quantum information. Surprisingly, very little is known in terms of which quantum state is steerable (see, however, [6, 10–12]). Here, we derive some generic sufficient conditions for steerability that can be applied to quantum state of arbitrary Hilbert space dimensions.

Given that some entangled quantum state ρ cannot exhibit steering [6, 7, 12–15], a natural question that arises is whether the steerability of such a state can be *superactivated* by allowing joint measurements on multiple copies of ρ. In other words, is it possible that some ρ that is not steerable becomes steerable if local measurements are performed instead on $\rho^{\otimes k}$ for some large enough k? Building on some recent results established for Bell-nonlocality [16, 17], we provide here an affirmative answer to the above question.

Note that even for a quantum state ρ that is steerable,

it is interesting to investigate how their steerability scales with the number of copies. For instance, is it possible to amplify the amount of steering-inequality violation by an *arbitrarily large* amount if only a small number of copies is available (see [16] for analogous works in the context of Bell-nonlocality)? Again, we provide a positive answer to this question, showing that an unbounded amount of amplification can be obtained by allowing joint measurements on as few as three copies of a quantum state that is barely steerable.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. In Section II, we give a brief overview on some of the basic notions in Bell-nonlocality and EPR steering that we will need in subsequent discussions. There, inspired by the work of Cavalcanti *et al.* [17], we also introduce the notion of *steering fraction* and *largest (steering-inequality) violation*, which are crucial quantities that lead to many of the findings mentioned above. For instance, in Section III, we use these quantities to derive (1) a general sufficient condition for an arbitrary quantum state ρ to be steerable and (2) an upper bound on the largest steering-inequality violation of an arbitrary finite-dimensional maximally entangled state as a function of its Hilbert space dimension d. Quantification of steerability using a strengthened version of steering fraction is discussed in Section IV — there, we also demonstrate how this novel steering monotone [18] is related to the others, such as the steerable weight [19] and steering robustness [9]. In Section V, we show explicitly the superactivation of steerability as well as unbounded amplification of steerability. We conclude in Section VI with a discussion and some opened problems for future research.

II. PRELIMINARY NOTIONS

Consider a Bell-type experiment between two parties Alice and Bob. The correlation between measurement outcomes can be succinctly summarized by a vector of joint conditional distributions $\mathbf{P} \coloneqq \{P(a,b|x,y)\}$ where, x and a (y and b) are, respectively, the label of Alice's (Bob's) measurement settings and outcomes. The correlation admits a *local hidden-variable* (LHV) model if $\mathbf{P}$ is Bell-local [4], i.e., can be decomposed for all a,b,x,y as

$$P(a,b|x,y) = \int P_\lambda P(a|x,\lambda)P(b|y,\lambda)d\lambda, \tag{1}$$

for some *fixed* choice of $P_\lambda \geq 0$ satisfying $\int P_\lambda \, d\lambda = 1$, single-partite distributions $\{P(a|x,\lambda)\}_{a,x,\lambda}$, and $\{P(b|y,\lambda)\}_{b,y,\lambda}$.

Any correlation that is not Bell-local (henceforth *nonlocal*) can be witnessed by the violation of some (linear) Bell inequality,[1]

$$\sum_{a,b,x,y} B_{ab|xy}\, P(a,b|x,y) \overset{\text{LHV}}{\leq} \omega(\mathbf{B}), \tag{2a}$$

specified by a vector of real numbers $\mathbf{B} \coloneqq \{B_{ab|xy}\}_{a,b,x,y}$ (known as the Bell coefficients) and the *local bound*

$$\omega(\mathbf{B}) \coloneqq \sup_{\mathbf{P}\in\text{LHV}} \sum_{a,b,x,y} B_{ab|xy}\, P(a,b|x,y). \tag{2b}$$

In the literature, the left-hand-side of Eq. (2a) is also known as a *Bell polynomial* [20] or a *Bell functional* [21], as it maps any given correlation $\mathbf{P}$ into a real number.

To determine if a quantum state (and more generally if a given correlation $\mathbf{P}$) is nonlocal, one can, without loss of generality consider Bell coefficients that are non-negative, i.e., $B_{ab|xy} \geq 0$ for all a,b,x,y. To see this, it suffices to note that any Bell inequality, Eq. (2a), can be cast in a form that involves only non-negative Bell coefficients, e.g., by using the identity $\sum_{a,b} P(a,b|x,y) = 1$, which holds for all x,y.

Specifically, in terms of the *nonlocality fraction* Γ [17],

$$\Gamma(\mathbf{P},\mathbf{B}) \coloneqq \frac{1}{\omega(\mathbf{B})} \sum_{a,b,x,y} B_{ab|xy}\, P(a,b|x,y), \tag{3}$$

$\mathbf{P}$ violates the Bell inequality corresponding to $\mathbf{B}$ (and hence being nonlocal) if and only if $\Gamma(\mathbf{P},\mathbf{B}) > 1$.

Importantly, nonlocal quantum correlation

$$P(a,b|x,y) = \text{tr}\left[\rho\, \left(E_{a|x} \otimes E_{b|y}\right)\right] \tag{4}$$

can be obtained [2] by performing appropriately local measurements on certain entangled quantum state ρ, where $\mathbb{E}_\text{A} \coloneqq \{E_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$ ($\mathbb{E}_\text{B} \coloneqq \{E_{b|y}\}_{b,y}$) are the sets of positive-operator-value measure (POVM) [3] acting on Alice's (Bob's) Hilbert space. From now onwards, we will use $\mathbb{E}_\text{A}$ ($\mathbb{E}_\text{B}$) to denote a set of POVMs on Alice's (Bob's) Hilbert space, and $\mathbb{E}$ to their union, i.e., $\mathbb{E} \coloneqq \mathbb{E}_\text{A} \cup \mathbb{E}_\text{B}$.

Whenever the measurement outcome corresponding to $E_{a|x}$ is observed on Alice's side, quantum theory dictates that the (unnormalized) quantum state

$$\sigma_{a|x} = \text{tr}_\text{A}[\rho\,(E_{a|x} \otimes \mathbb{I}_\text{B})] \tag{5}$$

is prepared on Bob's side, where tr_A denotes the partial trace over Alice's subsystem and $\mathbb{I}_\text{B}$ is the identity operator acting on Bob's Hilbert space. An *assemblage* [22] of conditional quantum states $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \coloneqq \{\sigma_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$ is said to admit a *local-hidden-state* (LHS) model [6] if it is *unsteerable*, i.e., if it can be decomposed for all a,x as $\sigma_{a|x} = \int P_\lambda P(a|x,\lambda)\sigma_\lambda \, d\lambda$ for some *fixed* choice of $P_\lambda \geq 0$

[1] Bell inequality that is not linear in $\mathbf{P}$, or which involves *complex* combinations of $P(a,b|x,y)$ have also been considered in the literature, but we will not consider them in this paper.

satisfying $\int P_\lambda \, d\lambda = 1$, single-partite density matrices $\{\sigma_\lambda\}_\lambda$, and single-partite distribution $\{P(a|x,\lambda)\}_{a,x,\lambda}$. Equivalently, a correlation $\mathbf{P}$ admits a LHS model if it can be decomposed as:

$$P(a,b|x,y) = \int P_\lambda P(a|x,\lambda) \mathrm{tr}\left(E_{b|y}\, \sigma_\lambda\right) d\lambda, \qquad (6)$$

Conversely, an assemblage $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ that is steerable can be witnessed by the violation of a steering inequality [23],

$$\sum_{a,x} \mathrm{tr}(F_{a|x}\sigma_{a|x}) \overset{\text{LHS}}{\leq} \omega_s(\mathbf{F}), \qquad (7a)$$

specified by a set of Hermitian matrices $\mathbf{F} \coloneqq \{F_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$ and the *steering bound*

$$\omega_s(F) \coloneqq \sup_{\sigma \in \text{LHS}} \sum_{a,x} \mathrm{tr}(F_{a|x}\sigma_{a|x}). \qquad (7b)$$

In the literature, the left-hand-side of Eq. (7a) is also known as a *steering functional* [24], as it maps any given assemblage $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \{\sigma_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$ to a real number.

As with Bell-nonlocality, in order to determine if a given assemblage is steerable, one can consider, without loss of generality, steering functionals defined only by non-negative, or equivalently positive semidefinite $F_{a|x}$, i.e., $F_{a|x} \succeq 0$ for all a, x. To see this, it is sufficient to note that any steering inequality, Eq. (7a), can be rewritten in a form that involves only non-negative $F_{a|x}$, e.g., by using the identity $\sum_a \mathrm{tr}\left(\sigma_{a|x}\right) = 1$, which holds for all x. Hereafter, we thus restrict our attention to $\mathbf{F}$ ($\mathbf{B}$) having only non-negative $F_{a|x}$ ($B_{ab|xy}$).

In analogy with the nonlocality fraction, we now introduce the *steering fraction*

$$\Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{F}) := \frac{1}{\omega_s(\mathbf{F})} \sum_{a,x} \mathrm{tr}(F_{a|x}\sigma_{a|x}), \qquad (8)$$

to capture the steerability of an assemblage — an assemblage $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ violates the steering inequality corresponding to $\mathbf{F}$ if and only if $\Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{F}) > 1$. Whenever we want to emphasize the steerability of the underlying state ρ giving rise to the assemblage ρ, we will write $\Gamma_s(\{\rho, \mathbb{E}_\mathrm{A}\}, \mathbf{F})$ instead of $\Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{F})$ where $\mathbb{E}_\mathrm{A} = \{E_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} := \{\sigma_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$, and ρ are understood to satisfy Eq. (5). In particular, we say that a bipartite state ρ is $\mathbf{F}$-*steerable* (*from Alice to Bob*)[2] if there exists a set of local POVMs $\mathbb{E}_\mathrm{A}$ such that $\Gamma_s(\{\rho, \mathbb{E}_\mathrm{A}\}, \mathbf{F}) > 1$. In other words, ρ is $\mathbf{F}$-steerable if and only if the largest violation of the steering inequality corresponding to $\mathbf{F}$ [24]

$$LV_s(\rho, \mathbf{F}) \coloneqq \sup_{\mathbb{E}_\mathrm{A}} \Gamma_s(\{\rho, \mathbb{E}_\mathrm{A}\}, \mathbf{F}) \qquad (9)$$

is greater than 1.

[2] Note that there exist quantum states that are steerable from Alice to Bob but not the other way around, see., e.g., [7, 25].

As mentioned in Section I, Bell-nonlocality is a stronger form of quantum nonlocality than quantum steering. Let us now illustrate this fact by using the quantities that we have introduced in this section. For any given $\mathbf{B} = \{B_{ab|xy}\}_{a,b,x,y}$ and Bob's measurements specified by the POVMs $\mathbb{E}_\mathrm{B} = \{E_{b|y}\}_{b,y}$, one obtains an *induced* steering inequality specified by

$$\mathbf{F}_{(\mathbf{B};\mathbb{E}_\mathrm{B})} \coloneqq \left\{ \sum_{b,y} B_{ab|xy} E_{b|y} \right\}_{a,x}. \qquad (10)$$

Using this equation, the definition of the steering bound $\omega_s(\mathbf{F}_{(\mathbf{B};\mathbb{E}_\mathrm{B})})$, the local bound $\omega(\mathbf{B})$ and the fact that $\mathrm{tr}(\sigma_\lambda E_{b|y})$ is only a *particular* kind of response function of the form $P(b|y,\lambda)$, one sees that

$$\omega_s(\mathbf{F}_{(\mathbf{B};\mathbb{E}_\mathrm{B})}) \leq \omega(\mathbf{B}). \qquad (11)$$

A geometrical representation of this fact can be found in Fig. 1.



FIG. 1. Schematic representation of the relationship between Bell inequalities, the induced steering inequalities and the different sets of correlations in the space of correlations $\{\mathbf{P}\}$. From the outermost to the innermost, we have, respectively, the set of quantum distributions [the grey ellipse, cf. Eq. (4)], the set of correlations admitting a LHV model [the blue polygon, cf. Eq. (1)], and the set of correlations admitting a LHS model for arbitrary $\mathbb{E}_\mathrm{B}$ [the purple ellipse, see Eq. (6)]. In this space, the collection of Bell coefficients $\{B_{ab|xy}\}_{a,b,x,y}$ defines a vector $\mathbf{B}$ while the Bell functional corresponds to the inner product between $\mathbf{B}$ and a generic vector $\mathbf{P}$ in this space. Hence, $\omega(\mathbf{B})$ is the largest inner product attainable by all $\mathbf{P} \in$ LHV (blue polygon) achieved, e.g., by the green point, while $\sup_{\mathbb{E}_\mathrm{B}} \omega_s(\mathbf{F}_{(\mathbf{B},\mathbb{E}_\mathrm{B})})$ is the highest inner product attainable by all $\mathbf{P} \in$ LHS (purple ellipse) achieved, e.g., by the red point. For *any* particular choice of Bob's POVM the set of correlations defined by Eq. (6) form a convex subset (not shown) of the full set of LHS correlations and thus $\omega_s(\mathbf{F}_{(\mathbf{B},\mathbb{E}_\mathrm{B})})$ may be achieved by some non-extremal point of the LHS set. For example, in the figure, $\omega_s(\mathbf{F}_{(\mathbf{B},\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_b)})$ is achieved by the interior orange point.

Hence, for any correlation $\mathbf{P}$ derived by performing local measurements $\mathbb{E}_{\rm B}$ on Bob's side, and the local measurements $\mathbb{E}_{\rm A}$ on Alice's side when they share a bipartite state ρ, it follows from Eq. (3), Eq. (4), Eq. (8), and Eq. (11) that

$$\Gamma(\mathbf{P},\mathbf{B}) \leq \Gamma_s(\{\rho,\mathbb{E}_{\rm A}\},\mathbf{F}_{(\mathbf{B};\mathbb{E}_{\rm B})}). \tag{12}$$

From here, it is clear that whenever ρ violates the Bell inequality specified by $\mathbf{B}$, i.e., $\Gamma(\mathbf{P},\mathbf{B})>1$, it must also be the case that ρ violates the steering inequality induced by $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\rm B}$, cf Eq. (10).

III. SUFFICIENT CONDITION FOR STEERABILITY AND THE LARGEST STEERING-INEQUALITY VIOLATION

Equipped with the tools presented above, our immediate goal now is to derive a sufficient condition for any quantum state ρ acting on $\mathbb{C}^d\otimes\mathbb{C}^d$ to be steerable in terms of its *fully entangled fraction* (FEF) [26, 27]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}(\rho) &\coloneqq \max_{\Psi}\langle\Psi|\rho|\Psi\rangle \\ &= \max_{U}\langle\Psi_d^+|(U\otimes\mathbb{I}_B)\,\rho\,(U\otimes\mathbb{I}_B)^\dagger|\Psi_d^+\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

In the above definition, $|\Psi_d^+\rangle \coloneqq \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\sum_{i=0}^{d-1}|i\rangle|i\rangle$ is the generalized singlet, and the maximization is taken over all maximally entangled states in $\mathbb{C}^d\otimes\mathbb{C}^d$, or equivalently over all $d\times d$ unitary operators U. Note that in arriving at the second line of Eq. (13), we make use of the fact that $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$ is invariant under local unitary transformation of the form $U\otimes U^*$. Thus, any maximally entangled stated in $\mathbb{C}^d\otimes\mathbb{C}^d$ can be obtained from $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$ by a local unitary transformation acting on Alice's Hilbert space alone. Alternatively, one may also make use of the identity $(A\otimes\mathbb{I}_{\rm B})|\Psi_d^+\rangle = (\mathbb{I}_A\otimes A^{\rm T})|\Psi_d^+\rangle$ which holds for all normal operators A [29], where $A^{\rm T}$ is the transpose of A.

Clearly, the FEF of a state ρ is invariant under local unitary transformation but may decrease when subjected to the $(U\otimes U^*)$-twirling operation [28, 30]

$$T(\rho) \coloneqq \int_{U(d)}(U\otimes U^*)\rho(U\otimes U^*)^\dagger dU \tag{14}$$

where U^* is the complex conjugate of U and dU is the Haar measure over the group of $d\times d$ unitary matrices. Using a somewhat similar reasoning, one can establish the following Lemma (whose proof can be found in Appendix A).

Lemma III.1. *For any given state ρ, local POVMs $\mathbb{E}_{\rm A}=\{E_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$, and $\mathbf{F}=\{F_{a|x}\succeq 0\}_{a,x}$ acting on $\mathbb{C}^d\otimes\mathbb{C}^d$, there exists another state ρ', unitary operators U and U' such that*

$$\mathcal{F}[T(\rho')] = \langle\Psi_d^+|\rho'|\Psi_d^+\rangle = \mathcal{F}(\rho') = \mathcal{F}(\rho), \tag{15a}$$

$$\Gamma_s(\{\rho,\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\rm A}\},\tilde{\mathbf{F}}) \geq \Gamma_s[\{T(\rho'),\mathbb{E}_{\rm A}\},\mathbf{F}], \tag{15b}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\rm A}\coloneqq\left\{U^\dagger\,E_{a|x}\,U\right\}_{a,x}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}\coloneqq\left\{U'^\dagger\,F_{a|x}\,U'\right\}_{a,x}$.

While we shall be concerned, generally, only with non-negative $\mathbf{F}$ (we will say $\mathbf{F}$ ($\mathbf{B}$) is non-negative if it is formed by non-negative $F_{a|x}$ ($B_{ab|xy}$) from now on), it is worth noting that Lemma III.1 also holds for $\mathbf{F}$ formed by arbitrary Hermitian (but not necessarily non-negative) $F_{a|x}$ if the steering fraction and the corresponding steering bound are defined with an absolute sign, i.e., $\Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\mathbf{F}) = \left|\frac{1}{\omega_s(\mathbf{F})}\sum_{a,x}\mathrm{tr}(F_{a|x}\sigma_{a|x})\right|$.

Recall from [28] that the $(U\otimes U^*)$-twirling operation $T(\rho)$ always gives rise to an isotropic state

$$\rho_{\rm iso}(p) \coloneqq p|\Psi_d^+\rangle\langle\Psi_d^+| + (1-p)\frac{\mathbb{I}}{d^2}, \tag{16}$$

where $p\in[-\frac{1}{d^2-1},1]$ and $\mathbb{I}$ is the identity operator acting on the composite Hilbert space. In this case, it thus follows from Eq. (15) that

$$\Gamma_s\left(\left\{\rho,\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\rm A}\right\},\tilde{\mathbf{F}}\right) \geq \mathcal{F}(\rho)\Gamma_s(\left\{|\Psi_d^+\rangle,\mathbb{E}_{\rm A}\right\},\mathbf{F}) + Z \tag{17}$$

where $Z\geq 0$ is the contribution of $\mathbb{I}-|\Psi_d^+\rangle\langle\Psi_d^+|$ towards the steering fraction. Maximizing both sides over $\mathbb{E}$ and dropping contribution from the second term gives $LV_s(\rho,\mathbf{F}) \geq \mathcal{F}(\rho)LV_s(|\Psi_d^+\rangle,\mathbf{F})$. Recall from the definition of LV_s that a steering inequality is violated if $LV_s>1$, thus rearranging the term gives the following sufficient condition for ρ to be steerable.

Theorem III.2. *Given a state ρ and $\mathbf{F}=\{F_{a|x}\succeq 0\}_{a,x}$ acting on $\mathbb{C}^d\otimes\mathbb{C}^d$. A sufficient condition for ρ to be steerable from Alice to Bob is*

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho) > \frac{1}{LV_s(|\Psi_d^+\rangle,\mathbf{F})}. \tag{18}$$

Since $\mathcal{F}(\rho^{\otimes k})\geq[\mathcal{F}(\rho)]^k$, a direct corollary of Theorem III.2 is that, when joint local measurements are allowed, $\rho^{\otimes k}$ becomes steerable if for some $k>1$:

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho) > \left[\frac{1}{LV_s(|\Psi_{d^k}^+\rangle,\mathbf{F})}\right]^{\frac{1}{k}}. \tag{19}$$

It is worth noting that Theorem III.2 holds for general POVMs. If one restricts to projective measurements, it is clear that that the corresponding largest violation, which we denote by $LV_s^\pi(|\Psi_d^+\rangle,\mathbf{F})$ may be suboptimal, likewise for the threshold for $\mathcal{F}$ derived from Eq. (18), i.e., $\mathcal{F}>1/LV_s^\pi(|\Psi_d^+\rangle,\mathbf{F})\geq 1/LV_s(|\Psi_d^+\rangle,\mathbf{F})$. Using the fact mentioned between Eq. (13) and Eq. (14), it is easy to see that $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$ in inequality (18) can be replaced by any other state that is local-unitarily equivalent to $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$. Note also that an exactly analogous treatment can be applied to Bell-nonlocality, thereby giving a sufficient condition for bipartite Bell-nonlocality in terms of the fully entangled fraction of a state ρ (see Appendix B for details).

Let us also briefly comment on the tightness of the sufficient conditions derived from Theorem III.2. Evidently, in order for the sufficient condition derived therefrom to be tight, the inequality in Eq. (15b) must be saturated

and the non-negative term Z that appears in Eq. (17) must vanish. While the first of these conditions can be met, e.g., by choosing a state ρ that is invariant under the $(U \otimes U^*)$-twirling (and hence being an isotropic state), the second of these conditions generally cannot be met at the same time. The relevance of Theorem III.2 thus lies on its simplicity and generality, as we now demonstrate with the following explicit examples.

A. Explicit examples of sufficient condition

As an application of our sufficient condition, consider the $\mathbf{F}_{\text{MUB}} := \{|\phi_{a|x}\rangle\langle\phi_{a|x}|\}_{a,x}$ induced by a set of n mutually unbiased (orthonormal) bases (MUB) $\{|\phi_{a|x}\rangle\}_{a,x}$ in a d-dimensional Hilbert space [31]. $\mathbf{F}_{\text{MUB}}$ is non-negative since it involves only rank-one projectors [31]. It was shown in Ref. [31] that

$$LV_s(|\Psi_d^+\rangle, \mathbf{F}) \geq \max\left\{\frac{n\sqrt{d}}{n+1+\sqrt{d}}, \frac{d\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{n}+d-1}\right\}. \tag{20}$$

Using this in Theorem III.2, one finds that a sufficient condition for *any* bipartite state ρ in $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ to be steerable is

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho) > \min\left\{\frac{n+1+\sqrt{d}}{n\sqrt{d}}, \frac{\sqrt{n}+d-1}{d\sqrt{n}}\right\}. \tag{21}$$

When d is a power of a prime number [31, 32], one can find $n = d+1$ MUB, the second of the two arguments in the right-hand-side of Eq. (21) is smaller, thus simplifying the sufficient condition to

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho) > \frac{d-1+\sqrt{d+1}}{d\sqrt{d+1}}. \tag{22}$$

This implies, for instance, (two-way) steerability of an *arbitrary* two-qubit state ρ if $\mathcal{F}(\rho) > \frac{1+\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{3}} \approx 0.7887$ and an *arbitrary* two-qutrit state ρ if $\mathcal{F}(\rho) > \frac{2}{3}$ etc. Asymptotically, when $d \to \infty$, the sufficient condition of Eq. (22) simplifies to $\mathcal{F}(\rho) \gtrsim \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}$, making it evident that this simple criterion becomes especially effective in detecting steerable states for large d.

B. Upper bound on the largest steering-inequality violation of $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$

Instead of sufficient conditions for steerability, Theorem III.2 can also be used to derive upper bound on the largest steering-inequality violation by $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$ for arbitrary non-negative $\mathbf{F}$, as we now demonstrate.

Consider again the isotropic state given in Eq. (16), which is known to be entangled if and only if $p > p_{\text{ent}} := 1/(d+1)$ [4, 28]. Moreover, $\rho_{\text{iso}}(p)$ is non-steerable under general POVMs if [15] $p \leq \tilde{p}^{\phi} := \frac{3d-1}{d^2-1}\left(1-\frac{1}{d}\right)^d$, but steerable with projective measurement if and only if [6] $p > p_{\text{steer}} := (H_d - 1)/(d-1)$ where $H_d := \sum_{n=1}^{d} \frac{1}{n}$ is the d-th Harmonic number. For $p \in [0,1]$, it is easy to see that

$$\mathcal{F}[\rho_{\text{iso}}(p)] = p + \tfrac{1-p}{d^2}, \tag{23}$$

thus the critical value of FEF beyond which $\rho_{\text{iso}}(p)$ becomes steerable with projective measurements is $\mathcal{F}[\rho_{\text{iso}}(p)] > \mathcal{F}_{\text{iso},d}^{\text{steer}} := \frac{H_d + H_d d - d}{d^2}$.

In order for this steerability criterion for isotropic state to be compatible with Theorem III.2, we must have $\frac{1}{LV_s(|\Psi_d^+\rangle, \mathbf{F})} \geq \frac{H_d + H_d d - d}{d^2}$. Otherwise, one would find $\rho_{\text{iso}}(p)$ with $\mathcal{F}[\rho_{\text{iso}}(p)] < \mathcal{F}_{\text{iso},d}^{\text{steer}}$ that is steerable according to Theorem III.2, which is a contradiction. Thus, the above necessary and sufficient condition for steerability of $\rho_{\text{iso}}(p)$ with projective measurements implies the following upper bound on the largest steering-inequality violation of $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$.

Theorem III.3. *The largest steering-inequality violation of $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$ for all $\mathbf{F} = \{F_{a|x} \succeq 0\}_{a,x}$ is upper bounded as:*

$$LV_s^{\pi}(|\Psi_d^+\rangle, \mathbf{F}) \leq \frac{d^2}{H_d + H_d d - d} \tag{24}$$

for projective measurements.

To understand the asymptotic behavior of this upper bound, note that when $d \gg 1$, we have

$$\frac{d}{H_d + H_d d - d} \approx \frac{1}{H_d} < \frac{1}{\ln d}. \tag{25}$$

This means that $LV_s^{\pi}(|\Psi_d^+\rangle, F)$ scales as $\frac{d}{\ln d}$ for sufficiently large d. In particular, it can be shown[3] that $\frac{d^2}{H_d + H_d d - d} \leq 1.0900 \frac{d}{\ln d}$. Thus our upper bound on $LV_s^{\pi}(|\Psi_d^+\rangle, \mathbf{F})$ has an asymptotic scaling that improves over the result of Yin *at al.* [24] by a factor of $\frac{1}{\ln d}$,[4] and has the same scaling as the upper bound on the largest Bell-inequality violation of $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$ with projective measurements due to Palazuelos (see the last equation at page 1971 of [33]).

Let us also remark that since the upper bound of Eq. (24) holds for *all* linear steering inequalities specified by non-negative $\mathbf{F}$, it also serves as a legitimate upper bound on the largest Bell-inequality violation of $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$ with projective measurements for all *linear Bell inequalities* with *non-negative* Bell coefficients. A proof of this can be found in Appendix B. For linear Bell inequalities specified by non-negative $\mathbf{B}$, our upper bound

[3] As d increases from 1, the function $\frac{\ln d}{H_d + H_d d - d}$ increases monotonically until a maximum value at $d = 48$ and decreases monotonically after that.

[4] Their Proposition 2.17 implies an upper bound that scales as $\lesssim d$.

thus strengthens the upper bound due to Palazuelos for largest Bell-inequality violation of $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$ with projective measurements by more than a factor of 2. For $d = 2$, such an upper bound on the largest Bell-inequality violation of $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$ can be improved further using results from [34, 35], see Appendix B for details.

IV. QUANTIFYING STEERABILITY

Evidently, as we demonstrate in Section III, steering fraction is a very powerful tool for characterizing the steerability of quantum states. A natural question that arises is whether a maximization of steering fraction over all (non-negative) **F**leads to a proper *steering quantifier*, i.e., a *convex steering monotone* [18].

To this end, let us define, for any given assemblage $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \{\sigma_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$, the *optimal steering fraction* as:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \coloneqq \max\left\{0, \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{F}) - 1\right\}, \tag{26}$$

where the supremum $\sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0}$ is taken over all non-negative $\mathbf{F}$. From here, one can further define the optimal steering fraction of a quantum state ρ by optimizing over all assemblages that arise from local measurements on one of the parties. Superficially, such a quantifier for steerability bears some similarity with that defined in [36] but in the steering measure defined therein, there is a further optimization over all possible steering-inequality violations by *all possible quantum states*, which is not present in our definition.

In Appendix C, we prove that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}$ is indeed a convex steering monotone, i.e., it satisfies:

1. $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = 0$ for all unsteerable assemblages $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$;
2. $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}$ does not increase, on average, under deterministic *one-way local operations and classical communications* (1W-LOCCs);
3. For all convex decomposition of $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \mu\boldsymbol{\sigma}' + (1-\mu)\boldsymbol{\sigma}''$ in terms of other assemblages $\boldsymbol{\sigma}'$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}''$, $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq \mu\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}') + (1-\mu)\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}'')$.

Moreover, quantitative relations between $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}$ and two other convex steering monotones, namely, steerable weight ($\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{W}}$) [19] and steering robustness ($\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{R}}$) [9] can be established, as we now demonstrate.

A. Quantitative relation between $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}$ and steerable weight

To begin with, we recall from [19] that for any assemblage $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \{\sigma_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$, $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{W}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ is defined as the minimum non-negative real value ν satisfying $\sigma_{a|x} = (1-\nu)\sigma_{a|x}^{\mathrm{US}} + \nu\sigma_{a|x}^{\mathrm{S}}$ for all a and x, where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{US}} \coloneqq \{\sigma_{a|x}^{\mathrm{US}}\}_{a,x} \in \mathrm{LHS}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} \coloneqq \{\sigma_{a|x}^{\mathrm{S}}\}_{a,x}$ is a steerable assemblage. In other words, $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{W}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ is the minimum weight assigned to a steerable assemblage when optimized over all possible convex decompositions of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ into a steerable assemblage $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}}$ and an unsteerable assemblage $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{US}}$. In Appendix C 2, we establish the following quantitative relations between $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{W}}$.

Proposition IV.1. *Given an assemblage $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ with the decomposition $\sigma_{a|x} = [1-\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{W}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]\sigma_{a|x}^{\mathrm{US}} + \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{W}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\sigma_{a|x}^{\mathrm{S}}$, where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{US}} \in \mathrm{LHS}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}}$ is steerable, we have*

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{W}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}}) \leq \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) + 2\left[1 - \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{W}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\right] \tag{27}$$

Note that if a given assemblage $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is steerable, and hence $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}}) \neq 0$, Eq. (27) can be rearranged to give

$$\frac{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}})} \leq \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{W}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq \frac{2 + \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{2 + \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}})}. \tag{28}$$

This means that if $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}}$ are both largely *steerable* so that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}}) \gg 1$,[5] Eq.(28) leads to the following approximation:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{W}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \approx \frac{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}})}, \tag{29}$$

which provides an estimate of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{W}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ in terms of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}})$ when the two latter quantities are large.

B. Quantitative relation between $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}$ and steering robustness

For any given assemblage $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, its steering robustness $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{R}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ is defined as the minimal value $\nu \in [0, \infty)$ such that the convex mixture $\frac{1}{1+\nu}\boldsymbol{\sigma} + \frac{\nu}{1+\nu}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ is unsteerable for some assemblage $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$. In Appendix C 3, we derive the following quantitative relations between $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{R}}$.

Proposition IV.2. *For an assemblage $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ giving the unsteerable decomposition $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{US}} \coloneqq \frac{1}{1+\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{R}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}\boldsymbol{\sigma} + \frac{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{R}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{1+\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{R}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ is a legitimate assemblage, we have*

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{R}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) - 2 \leq \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{R}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\left[\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) + 2\right] \tag{30}$$

Note that if $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ is steerable, then $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) > 0$, thus Eq. (30) can be rearranged to give

$$\frac{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) + 2} \leq \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{R}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq \frac{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) + 2}{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})}. \tag{31}$$

As with the case of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{W}}$, if $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) \gg 1$, Eq.(31) implies the following approximation:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{R}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \approx \frac{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})}, \tag{32}$$

which provides an estimate of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{R}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ in terms of the optimal steering fraction $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{O}}$.

---

[5] This happens if there exist $\mathbf{F}_1$ and $\mathbf{F}_2$ such that $\Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{F}_1) \gg 1$ and $\Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}}, \mathbf{F}_2) \gg 1$.

V. SUPERACTIVATION AND UNBOUNDED AMPLIFICATION OF STEERABILITY

Let us now turn our attention to the superactivation and amplification of steerability.

A. Superactivation of steerability

Following the terminology introduced by Palazuelos [16] in the context of Bell-nonlocality, we say that the steerability of a quantum state ρ can be *superactivated* if it satisfies:

$$LV_s(\rho, \mathbf{F}) \leq 1 \quad \forall\ \mathbf{F}, \tag{33a}$$

$$\Gamma_s\left(\left\{\rho^{\otimes k}, \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{A}}\right\}, \mathbf{F}'\right) > 1 \quad \text{for some } k,\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{A}} \text{ and } \mathbf{F}'. \tag{33b}$$

The possibility to superactivate Bell-nonlocality—a question originally posed in [37]—was first demonstrated by Palazuelos [16] using certain entangled isotropic state. Their result was soon generalized by Cavalcanti *et al.* [17] to show that the Bell-nonlocality of all entangled states with FEF $> \frac{1}{d}$ can be superactivated. Since all Bell-nonlocal states are also steerable [6, 7], while entangled $\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(p)$ are exactly those having FEF$> \frac{1}{d}$, the steerability of all entangled but unsteerable $\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(p)$ can be superactivated (e.g., those with $p_{\mathrm{ent}} < p \leq \tilde{p}^{\phi}$, see Section III B on page 5).

For the benefit of subsequent discussion on the amplification of steerability, it is worth going through the key steps involved in the proof of this superactivation. To this end, let us first recall from [21, 38] the Khot-Vishnoi (KV) nonlocal game, which is parametrized by $\eta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Let us denote by $G = \{0,1\}^n$ the group of n bit strings with $\oplus$, bitwise addition modulo 2 being the group operation. Consider the (normal) Hadamard subgroup H of G which contains n elements. The cosets of H in G give rise to the quotient group $\frac{G}{H}$ with $\frac{2^n}{n}$ elements. The KV game can then be written in the form of a Bell inequality, cf. Eq. (2), with $\frac{2^n}{n}$ inputs and n outputs:[6]

$$\sum_{a\in x, b\in y} \sum_{x,y\in \frac{G}{H}} B^{\mathrm{KV}}_{ab|xy}\ P(a,b|x,y) \overset{\mathrm{LHV}}{\leq} \omega(\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{KV}}),$$

$$B^{\mathrm{KV}}_{ab|xy} \coloneqq \sum_{z\in G} \frac{n}{2^n} \eta^{w_z} (1-\eta)^{n-w_z} \delta_{a\oplus z, b} \delta_{x\oplus z, y} \tag{34}$$

where w_z is the Hamming weight of $z \in G$ and $\delta_{i,j}$ is the Kronecker delta between i and j, [7] and $\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{KV}}$ is the set of Bell coefficients defining the KV game.

[6] Evidently, the KV game defined here only makes sense when the number of outputs is a power of 2. Generalization of this to the situation where n can be an arbitrary positive integer has been considered, for example, in [33].

[7] Note that for $x, y \in \frac{G}{H}$ and $z \in G$, $\delta_{x\oplus z, y} = 1$ if and only if $x \oplus z$ and y share the same coset in $\frac{G}{H}$, where $x \oplus z \coloneqq \{h \oplus z | h \in x\}$.

An important feature of $\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{KV}}$ given in Eq. (34) is that $\omega(\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{KV}}) \leq n^{-\frac{\eta}{1-\eta}}$ [16, 21] . For the specific choice [16] of $\eta = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\ln n}$ — which makes sense only for $n \geq 8$ — this gives $\omega(\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{KV}}) \leq n^{-1+\frac{4}{2\ln n}} < \frac{C_u}{n}$ with $C_u = e^4$. In this case, performing judiciously chosen rank-1 projective measurements specified by $\mathbb{E}^{\mathrm{KV}} = \mathbb{E}^{\mathrm{KV}}_{\mathrm{A}} \bigcup \mathbb{E}^{\mathrm{KV}}_{\mathrm{B}}$, where $\mathbb{E}^{\mathrm{KV}}_{\mathrm{A}} \coloneqq \{E^{\mathrm{KV}}_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$ and $\mathbb{E}^{\mathrm{KV}}_{\mathrm{B}} \coloneqq \{E^{\mathrm{KV}}_{b|y}\}_{b,y}$, on $|\Psi^+_D\rangle$ (with $D = n$) gives rise to a correlation $\mathbf{P}^{\mathrm{KV}}$ with the following lower bound on the nonlocality fraction

$$\Gamma\left(\mathbf{P}^{\mathrm{KV}}, \mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{KV}}\right) > C \frac{D}{(\ln D)^2} \tag{35}$$

where $C = 4e^{-4}$.

Consider now the collection of non-negative matrices $\mathbf{F}^{\mathrm{KV}} \coloneqq \{F^{\mathrm{KV}}_{a|x} = \sum_{b,y} B^{\mathrm{KV}}_{ab|xy} E^{\mathrm{KV}}_{b|y}\}_{a,x}$ induced by the KV game and Bob's optimal POVM $\mathbb{E}^{\mathrm{KV}}_{\mathrm{B}}$ leading to the lower bound given in Eq. (35). An application of inequality (12) to Eq. (35) immediately leads to

$$\Gamma_s\left(\left\{|\Psi^+_D\rangle, \mathbb{E}^{\mathrm{KV}}_{\mathrm{A}}\right\}, \mathbf{F}^{\mathrm{KV}}\right) \geq \Gamma\left(\mathbf{P}^{\mathrm{KV}}, \mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{KV}}\right) > C \frac{D}{(\ln D)^2} \tag{36}$$

For any given state ρ, Lemma III.1, Eq. (17) and Eq. (36) together imply the existence of $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}^{\mathrm{KV}}_{\mathrm{A}} \coloneqq \{\tilde{E}^{\mathrm{KV}}_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$ such that

$$\Gamma_s\left(\left\{\rho, \tilde{\mathbb{E}}^{\mathrm{KV}}_{\mathrm{A}}\right\}, \tilde{\mathbf{F}}^{\mathrm{KV}}\right) \geq C \frac{\mathcal{F}(\rho) D}{(\ln D)^2} \tag{37}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{F}}^{\mathrm{KV}} \coloneqq \left\{ \tilde{F}^{\mathrm{KV}}_{a|x} = \sum_{b,y} U'^{\dagger} B^{\mathrm{KV}}_{ab|xy} E^{\mathrm{KV}}_{b|y} U' \right\}_{a,x}, \tag{38}$$

again is non-negative.

Note that if $\rho = \rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(p)^{\otimes k}$, we have both $D = d^k$ and $\mathcal{F}(\rho) = [\mathcal{F}(\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(p))]^k$ scaling exponentially with k, while $(\log D)^2 = k^2 \log^2 d$ only increases quadratically with k. Thus, Eq. (37) implies that $\mathcal{F}(\rho) > \frac{1}{d}$ is a sufficient condition for $\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(p)$ to be k-copy steerable. In other words, for all entangled $\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(p)$, $\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(p)^{\otimes k}$ is steerable for sufficiently large k. In particular, since $\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(p)$ for $p_{\mathrm{ent}} < p \leq \tilde{p}^{\phi}$ is *not* single-copy steerable, the steerability of $\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(p)$ with p in this interval can be superactivated.

B. Unbounded amplification of steerability

Given that joint measurements on appropriately chosen quantum state ρ can lead to the superactivation of steerability, one may ask, as with Bell-nonlocality (see [16]), if it is possible to obtain unbounded amplification of steerability of quantum state with joint measurements. In particular, since it is easier to exhibit EPR steering than Bell-nonlocality, can one achieve

unbounded violation of steerability (as quantified using steering fraction) using fewer copies of quantum state? Here, we provide an affirmative answer to these questions, as summarized in the following Theorem.

Theorem V.1. *For every $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, there exists an isotropic state $\rho_{iso}(p)$ with local dimension d such that*

$$LV_s^{\pi}(\rho_{iso}, \mathbf{F}) \leq \epsilon + 1 \quad \& \quad LV_s(\rho_{iso}^{\otimes 3}, \tilde{\mathbf{F}}^{KV}) > \delta \quad (39)$$

for all non-negative $\mathbf{F} = \{F_{a|x} \succeq 0\}_{a,x}$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}^{KV}$ is defined in Eq. (38) with local dimension d^3.

Proof. The proof of this is similar to that given by Palazuelos [16] for proving the unbounded amplification of Bell-nonlocality using 5 copies of $\rho_{\rm iso}(p)$. First of all, note from Eq. (16) and Eq. (9) that

$$\begin{aligned} LV_s^{\pi}(\rho_{\rm iso}, \mathbf{F}) &\leq pLV_s^{\pi}(|\Psi_d^+\rangle, \mathbf{F}) + (1-p)LV_s^{\pi}\left(\frac{\mathbb{I}}{d^2}, \mathbf{F}\right) \\ &\leq 1 + p[LV_s^{\pi}(|\Psi_d^+\rangle, \mathbf{F}) - 1]. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Recall from Eq. (24) that $LV_s^{\pi}(|\Psi_d^+\rangle, \mathbf{F})$ is upper bounded, thus $LV_s^{\pi}(\rho_{\rm iso}, \mathbf{F})$ is upper bounded by $1 + \epsilon$ if we set

$$p = \frac{\epsilon}{\frac{d^2}{H_d + H_d d - d} - 1}. \quad (41)$$

Using this, as well as Eq. (23) in Eq. (37) with $\rho = \rho_{\rm iso}(p)^{\otimes k}$ and $\mathcal{F}(\rho) = [\mathcal{F}(\rho_{\rm iso}(p))]^k$, we obtain

$$\Gamma_s\left(\left\{\rho, \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\rm A}^{\rm KV}\right\}, \tilde{\mathbf{F}}^{\rm KV}\right) \geq \frac{C\, d^k}{(k \ln d)^2}\left[-\epsilon + \frac{1+\epsilon}{d^2} + \frac{(d-1)\epsilon}{d - H_d}\right]^k, \quad (42)$$

For $d \gg 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_s\left(\left\{\rho, \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\rm A}^{\rm KV}\right\}, \tilde{\mathbf{F}}^{\rm KV}\right) &\geq \frac{C\, d^k\, \epsilon^k}{(k \ln d)^2}\left(\frac{H_d - 1}{d - H_d}\right)^k, \\ &\approx \frac{C\, \epsilon^k}{k^2}(\ln d)^{k-2}, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Thus, for $k \geq 3$, we see that $\Gamma_s\left(\left\{\rho_{\rm iso}(p), \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\rm A}^{\rm KV}\right\}, \tilde{\mathbf{F}}^{\rm KV}\right)$ with p defined in Eq. (41) can become arbitrarily large if we make d arbitrarily large. In particular, for any given ϵ, d must be large enough so that the p defined in Eq. (41) is larger than $\frac{1}{d+1}$, the critical value of p below which $\rho_{\rm iso}(p)$ becomes separable. □

VI. DISCUSSION

In this paper, we have introduced the tool of steering fraction Γ_s and used it to establish novel results spanning across various dimensions of the phenomenon of quantum steering. Below, we briefly summarize these results and comment on some possibilities for future research.

Firstly, we have derived a general sufficient condition for *any* bipartite quantum state ρ to be steerable in terms of its fully entangled fraction — a quantity that is closely related to its usefulness for teleportation. As we briefly discussed in Section III, these sufficient conditions will not be able to detect all steerable states. Nonetheless, let us stress that to determine if a quantum state is steerable (as with determining if a quantum state can exhibit Bell-nonlocality, see, e.g., [39, 40]) is generally a very difficult problem. The advantage of our criterion is that it does not require one to consider the infinitely many different steering inequalities that one can in principle test but only requires a relatively straightforward computation of the fully entangled fraction of the state of interest. Given that our sufficient condition is likely to be suboptimal, an obvious question that follows is whether one can find an explicit threshold $\mathcal{F}_{\rm thr}$ that is smaller than that given by Theorem III.2 such that $\mathcal{F} > \mathcal{F}_{\rm thr}$ still guarantees steerability. While this may seem like a difficult problem, recent advances [41] in the algorithmic construction of local hidden-variable (-state) models may shed some light on this. More generally, it will be interesting to know if our sufficient condition can be strengthened while preserving its computability. In particular, it will be very useful to find analogous steerability criteria that are tight.

On the other hand, the aforementioned sufficient condition has also enabled us to derive an upper bound—as a function of d—on the largest steering-inequality violation LV_s achievable by the maximally entangled state $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$. In particular, using the general connection between LV_s and the largest Bell-inequality violation, LV, established in Appendix B, our upper bound on LV_s implies an upper bound on LV by $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$ (for non-negative $\mathbf{B}$) that is somewhat tighter than that due to Palazuelos [33]. If any strengthened sufficient conditions for steerability, as discussed above, are found, it would also be interesting to see if they could lead to tighter (non-asymptotic) upper bound on the largest steering-inequality (and/or Bell-inequality) violation attainable by $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$.

The tool of steering fraction Γ_s, in addition, can be used to quantify steerability. In particular, we showed that if Γ_s is optimized over all (non-negative) $\mathbf{F}$, the resulting quantity can be cast as a *convex steering monotone* [18] which we referred to as the *optimal steering fraction* $\mathcal{S}_{\rm O}$. We further demonstrated how this monotone is quantitatively related to two other convex steering monotones — steerable weight [19] and steering robustness [9]. In the light of quantum information, it would be desirable to determine an operational meaning of $\mathcal{S}_{\rm O}$, e.g., in the context of some quantum information tasks (cf. steering robustness [9]). Establishment of quantitative relations between $\mathcal{S}_{\rm O}$ and other convex steering monotones, such the relative entropy of steering [18] would certainly be very welcome. In particular, it would be highly desirable to establish quantitative relations that allow one to estimate $\mathcal{S}_{\rm O}$ from other easily-computable steering monotones, such as the steerable weight, or the steering robustness.

Using the established sufficient condition for steerability, we have also demonstrated the superactivation of steerability, i.e., the phenomenon that certain unsteerable quantum state ρ becomes, for sufficiently large k, steerable when joint *local* measurements on $\rho^{\otimes k}$ are allowed. A drawback of the examples that we have presented here is that they inherit directly from the superactivation of Bell-nonlocality due to Palazuelos [16] and Cavalcanti *et al.* [17]. An obvious question that follows is whether one can construct explicit examples for the superactivation of steerability using quantum states whose Bell-nonlocality *cannot* be superactivated via joint measurements.

One the other hand, with joint local measurements, we showed that the steering-inequality violation of certain barely steerable ρ can be arbitrarily amplified, in particular, giving an arbitrarily large steering-inequality violation with $\rho^{\otimes 3}$. Could such unbounded amplification be achieved using joint measurement on two copies of the same state? Our proof technique, see Eq. (43), clearly requires a minimum of three copies for unbounded amplification to take place but it is conceivable that a smaller number of copies suffices if some other steering inequality is invoked, a problem that we shall leave for future research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge useful discussions with Nicolas Brunner, Daniel Cavalcanti, Flavien Hirsch, Marco Túlio Quintino and helpful suggestions from an anonymous referee of AQIS2016. This work is supported by the Ministry of Education, Taiwan, R.O.C., through "Aiming for the Top University Project" granted to the National Cheng Kung University (NCKU), and the Ministry of Science and Technology, Taiwan (Grant No.104-2112-M-006-021-MY3).

Note added.— While completing this manuscript, we became aware of the work of [42] who independently (1) derived a sufficient condition of steerability in terms of the fully entangled fraction and (2) demonstrated the superactivation of steering of the isotropic states.

Appendix A: Proof of Lemma III.1

Here, we provide a proof of Lemma III.1.

Proof. For any given state ρ', local POVM $\mathbb{E}_{\rm A}$ and non-negative $\mathbf{F}$, let us note that

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_s\left(\{T(\rho'),\mathbb{E}_{\rm A}\},\mathbf{F}\right) &\coloneqq \frac{\sum_{a,x}\mathrm{tr}\left[(E_{a|x}\otimes F_{a|x})T(\rho')\right]}{\omega_s(\mathbf{F})}\\ &= \int_{U(d)}\frac{\sum_{a,x}\mathrm{tr}\left[(U^\dagger E_{a|x}U\otimes U^{*\dagger}F_{a|x}U^*)\rho'\right]}{\omega_s(\mathbf{F})}\,dU\\ &= \int_{U(d)}\Gamma_s\left(\{\rho',\mathbb{E}_U\},\mathbf{F}_U\right)dU\\ &\leq \max_{U\in U(d)}\Gamma_s\left(\{\rho',\mathbb{E}_U\},\mathbf{F}_U\right)\end{aligned}\tag{A1}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_U \coloneqq \{U^\dagger E_{a|x}U\}$ and $\mathbf{F}_U \coloneqq \{U^{*\dagger}F_{a|x}U^*\}$.

Denoting by U_Γ the unitary operator achieving the maximum in Eq. (A1), then the above inequality implies that

$$\Gamma_s\left(\{\rho',\mathbb{E}_{U_\Gamma}\},\mathbf{F}_{U_\Gamma}\right)\geq\Gamma_s\left(\{T(\rho'),\mathbb{E}_{\rm A}\},\mathbf{F}\right).\tag{A2}$$

For any given state ρ, let us further denote by $U_{\mathcal{F}}$, the unitary operator that maximizes the FEF of ρ in Eq. (13), i.e.,

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho)=\langle\Psi_d^+|(U_{\mathcal{F}}\otimes\mathbb{I}_B)\,\rho\,(U_{\mathcal{F}}\otimes\mathbb{I}_B)^\dagger|\Psi_d^+\rangle.\tag{A3}$$

Defining $\rho' \coloneqq (U_{\mathcal{F}}\otimes\mathbb{I}_B)\,\rho\,(U_{\mathcal{F}}\otimes\mathbb{I}_B)^\dagger$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}'_{\rm A} = U_{\mathcal{F}}\,\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\rm A}\,U_{\mathcal{F}}^\dagger$, we then have

$$\Gamma_s\left(\left\{\rho,\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\rm A}\right\},\tilde{\mathbf{F}}\right)=\Gamma_s\left(\left\{\rho',\tilde{\mathbb{E}}'_{\rm A}\right\},\tilde{\mathbf{F}}\right)\tag{A4a}$$

with

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho)=\mathcal{F}(\rho')=\langle\Psi_d^+|\rho'|\Psi_d^+\rangle=\mathcal{F}\left[T(\rho')\right],\tag{A4b}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact [26, 28] that if $\mathcal{F}(\rho')$ is attained with $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$, then $\mathcal{F}\left[T(\rho')\right]$ is attained with $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$.

Combining Eq. (A2) and Eq. (A4) by setting $\mathbb{E}_{U_\Gamma}=\tilde{\mathbb{E}}'_{\rm A}$ and $\mathbf{F}_{U_\Gamma}=\tilde{\mathbf{F}}$ then gives the desired inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_s\left(\left\{\rho,\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\rm A}\right\},\tilde{\mathbf{F}}\right)&=\Gamma_s\left(\{\rho',\mathbb{E}_{U_\Gamma}\},\mathbf{F}_{U_\Gamma}\right)\\ &\geq\Gamma_s\left(\{T(\rho'),\mathbb{E}_{\rm A}\},\mathbf{F}\right),\end{aligned}\tag{A5}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\rm A}=U_{\mathcal{F}}^\dagger\,\tilde{\mathbb{E}}'_{\rm A}\,U_{\mathcal{F}}=U_{\mathcal{F}}^\dagger\,U_\Gamma^\dagger\mathbb{E}_{\rm A}\,U_\Gamma\,U_{\mathcal{F}},\\ \tilde{\mathbf{F}}=U_{\mathcal{F}}^{*\dagger}\,\mathbf{F}\,U_{\mathcal{F}}^*,\end{aligned}\tag{A6}$$

which completes the proof. □

As a remark, analogous steps but with max in Eq. (A1) replaced by min leads to the fact that for any given ρ, $\mathbb{E}_{\rm A}$, and non-negative $\mathbf{F}$, there exists $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\rm A}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}$ such that $\Gamma_s(\rho,\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\rm A},\tilde{\mathbf{F}})\leq\Gamma_s\left(\{T(\rho),\mathbb{E}_{\rm A}\},\mathbf{F}\right)$.

Appendix B: Sufficient Condition of Bell-nonlocality and Upper Bound on the Largest Bell-inequality Violation of $|\Psi_d^+\rangle$

1. Sufficient condition of Bell-nonlocality

For any given quantum state ρ, local POVMS $\mathbb{E}$, and (linear) Bell inequality Eq. (2), the largest Bell-inequality violation is defined as [16]:

$$LV(\rho, \mathbf{B}) \coloneqq \sup_{\mathbb{E}} \Gamma\left(\{\rho, \mathbb{E}\}, \mathbf{B}\right). \tag{B1}$$

Using arguments exactly analogous to the proof of Theorem III.2, one can establish the following sufficient condition for a bipartite quantum state ρ to be Bell-nonlocal.

Theorem B.1. *Given a state ρ acting on $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ and $\mathbf{B} \coloneqq \{B_{ab|xy} \geq 0\}_{a,b,x,y}$, a sufficient condition for ρ to violate the Bell inequality specified by $\mathbf{B}$ and hence being Bell-nonlocal is*

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho) > \frac{1}{LV(|\Psi_d^+\rangle, B)}. \tag{B2}$$

Note that unlike Theorem III.2, there is no local unitary degree of freedom in the right-hand-side of Eq. (B2). Using again the fact that $\mathcal{F}\left(\rho^{\otimes k}\right) \geq \left[\mathcal{F}(\rho)\right]^k$, a direct corollary of Theorem III.2 is the following sufficient condition for $\rho^{\otimes k}$ to be Bell-nonlocal:

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho) > \left[\frac{1}{LV(|\Psi_d^+\rangle, \mathbf{B})}\right]^{\frac{1}{k}}. \tag{B3}$$

As an explicit example, let us consider the family of 2-setting, d-outcome inequality due to Collins-Gisin-Linden-Massar-Popescu [43]. This inequality can be rewritten in a form that involves only the following non-negative coefficients:

$$B^{\text{CGLMP}}_{a,b|x,y} = \begin{cases} 2 + \frac{2(a-b)}{d-1} & : \quad b \geq a \text{ and } x+y=0 \\ \frac{2(a-b-1)}{d-1} & : \quad b < a \text{ and } x+y=0 \\ \frac{2(b-a-1)}{d-1} & : \quad b > a \text{ and } x+y=1 \\ 2 + \frac{2(b-a)}{d-1} & : \quad b \leq a \text{ and } x+y=1 \\ 2 - \frac{2(b-a-1)}{d-1} & : \quad b > a \text{ and } x+y=2 \\ \frac{2(a-b)}{d-1} & : \quad b \leq a \text{ and } x+y=2 \end{cases}, \tag{B4}$$

such that

$$\sum_{a,b=0}^{d-1} \sum_{x,y=0,1} B^{\text{CGLMP}}_{a,b|x,y} P(a,b|x,y) \overset{\text{LHV}}{\leq} 6. \tag{B5}$$

A (tight) lower bound on the largest Bell-inequality violation of this inequality can be inferred from the result presented in [43] as:

$$LV(|\Psi_d^+\rangle, \mathbf{B}^{\text{CGLMP}}) = \frac{2}{3}\left\{1 + d \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor - 1} \left(1 - \frac{2k}{d-1}\right)\left[q_k - q_{-(k+1)}\right]\right\}, \tag{B6}$$

where $q_k = \frac{1}{2d^3 \sin^3\left[\pi(k+\frac{1}{4})/d\right]}$. Putting Eq. (B6) into Eq. (B2), we thus see that

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho) > \frac{3}{2 + 2d\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor - 1}\left(1 - \frac{2k}{d-1}\right)\left[q_k - q_{-(k+1)}\right]} \tag{B7}$$

is a sufficient condition for Bell-nonlocality. For $d = 2$, this can be evaluated explicitly to give

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho) > \frac{3}{2+\sqrt{2}} \approx 0.8787 \tag{B8}$$

whereas in the asymptotic limit of $d \to \infty$, the sufficient condition becomes $\mathcal{F}(\rho) > 0.8611$.

2. Upper bound on the largest Bell-inequality violation

In this section, we demonstrate how the largest steering-inequality violation LV_s is related to the largest Bell-inequality violation LV for the case when $\mathbf{F}$ is induced from the given $\mathbf{B}$.

Theorem B.2. *Given $\mathbf{B} \coloneqq \{B_{ab|xy} \geq 0\}_{a,b,x,y}$ and a state ρ acting on $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$, we have*

$$LV(\rho, \mathbf{B}) \leq \sup_{\mathbb{E}_{\text{B}}} LV_s\left[\rho, \mathbf{F}_{(\mathbf{B};\mathbb{E}_{\text{B}})}\right], \tag{B9}$$

where the supremum is taken over all possible sets of Bob's POVMs $\mathbb{E}_{\text{B}} \coloneqq \{E_{b|y}\}_{b,y}$, and $\mathbf{F}_{(\mathbf{B};\mathbb{E}_{\text{B}})}$ is given by Eq. (10).

Proof. Let $\mathbb{E}_{\text{A}} \coloneqq \{E_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$ be a generic set of Alice's POVMs and $\mathbb{E}$ be the union of $\mathbb{E}_{\text{A}}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\text{B}}$. Suppose that the local POVMs $\mathbb{E}_{\text{A}}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\text{B}}$ acting on the joint state ρ of Alice and Bob gives rise to the correlation $\mathbf{P}$, then Eq. (12) implies that

$$\Gamma\left(\{\rho, \mathbb{E}\}, \mathbf{B}\right) \leq \Gamma_s\left(\{\rho, \mathbb{E}_{\text{A}}\}, \mathbf{F}_{(\mathbf{B};\mathbb{E}_{\text{B}})}\right), \tag{B10}$$

where we write $\Gamma(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}) \coloneqq \Gamma\left(\{\rho, \mathbb{E}\}, \mathbf{B}\right)$ to make the dependence of $\mathbf{P}$ on ρ and $\mathbb{E}$ explicit. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} LV(\rho, B) &= \sup_{\mathbb{E}} \Gamma\left(\{\rho, \mathbb{E}\}, \mathbf{B}\right) \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbb{E}_{\text{A}}, \mathbb{E}_{\text{B}}} \Gamma_s\left(\{\rho, \mathbb{E}_{\text{A}}\}, \mathbf{F}_{(\mathbf{B};\mathbb{E}_{\text{B}})}\right) \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbb{E}_{\text{B}}} LV_s\left[\rho, \mathbf{F}_{(\mathbf{B};\mathbb{E}_{\text{B}})}\right], \end{aligned} \tag{B11}$$

which completes the proof. □

Theorem B.2 implies that $LV(\rho, \mathbf{B})$ is upper-bounded by the highest value of the largest steering-inequality violation of steering inequalities that can be induced by $\mathbf{B}$. In this sense, we can interpret $\sup_{\mathbb{E}_{\text{B}}} LV_s[\rho, \mathbf{F}_{(\mathbf{B};\mathbb{E}_{\text{B}})}]$ as the largest steering-inequality violation arising from a given $\mathbf{B}$. In particular, the largest Bell-inequality violation achievable by maximally entangled state for *any*

non-negative $\mathbf{B}$ under projective measurements must also be *upper bounded* by Eq. (24):

$$LV^{\pi}(|\Psi_d^+\rangle, \mathbf{B}) \leq \frac{d^2}{H_d + H_d d - d}. \tag{B12}$$

Note that Eq. (B12) *implies*—with the fact given in footnote 3—Palazuelos' upper bound [33] of the largest Bell-inequality violation of maximally entangled states under projective measurement (for non-negative $\mathbf{B}$).

A nice feature of the upper bound on $LV^{\pi}(|\Psi_d^+\rangle, \mathbf{B})$ presented above is that it applies to all dimensions d and all non-negative $\mathbf{B}$. The drawback, however, is that they are generally not tight. For instance, for the two-qubit maximally entangled state, the inequality above gives $LV^{\pi}(|\Psi_{d=2}^+\rangle, \mathbf{B}) \leq 1.6$, but if we make explicit use of the nonlocal properties of $\rho_{\text{iso}}(p)$, then this bound can be tightened. Firstly, let us recall from [34] that the threshold value of p above which $\rho_{\text{iso}}(p)$ violates some Bell inequality by projective measurements is given by $p_c = \frac{1}{K_G(3)}$, where $K_G(3)$ is Grothendieck's constant of order 3 [44]. Although the exact value of the constant is not known, it is known to satisfy the following bounds:

$$1.4172 \leq K_G(3) \leq 1.5163, \tag{B13}$$

where the lower bound is due to Vértesi [35] and the upper bound is due to Krivine [45].

Note that for $d = 2$, $p = p_c$ corresponds to a FEF of $\mathcal{F}_c = \frac{1}{4}(3p_c + 1)$. Then, in order for Eq. (B2) to be consistent with this observation, we must have

$$LV^{\pi}(|\Psi_2^+\rangle, \mathbf{B}) \leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{F}_c} = \frac{4K_G(3)}{3 + K_G(3)} \leq 1.2552, \tag{B14}$$

where both bounds in Eq. (B13) have been used to arrive at the last inequality.

Appendix C: Proofs related to the properties of the optimal steering fraction

1. Proof that $\mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}$ is a convex steering monotone

The proof proceeds in two parts. We first show that $\mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}$ is a convex function that vanishes for unsteerable assemblages. We then show that it is a steering monotone [18], that is, non-increasing, on average, under one-way local operations and classical communications (1W-LOCC). The first part of the proof follows from the following Lemma.

Lemma C.1. *$\mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ is convex in $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ and satisfies $\mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = 0 \ \forall \ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in$ LHS.*

Proof. From the definition of $\Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{F})$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$, it follows immediately that $\mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = 0$ if $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in$ LHS. Note that for any *convex* decomposition of the assemblage $\sigma_{a|x} = \mu\sigma'_{a|x} + (1-\mu)\sigma''_{a|x}$ with $\mu \in [0,1]$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}'$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}''$ being two legitimate assemblages, we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{F}) \leq \mu \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}', \mathbf{F}) + (1-\mu) \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}'', \mathbf{F}).$$

When $\mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = 0$, the convexity of $\mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ holds trivially. In the non-trivial case when $\mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{F}) - 1 > 0$, it follows from the above inequality for the steering fractions that $\mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq \mu\mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}') + (1-\mu)\mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}'')$, which completes the proof of the convexity of $\mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}$. □

Next, we shall demonstrate the monotonicity of $\mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}$ by showing the following Theorem.

Theorem C.2. *$\mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}$ does not increase, on average, under deterministic 1W-LOCC, i.e. [18],*

$$\sum_{\omega} P(\omega)\, \mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}\left(\frac{\mathcal{M}_{\omega}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{P(\omega)}\right) \leq \mathcal{S}_{\text{O}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \tag{C1}$$

for all assemblages $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \{\sigma_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$, where $P(\omega) = \text{tr}[\mathcal{M}_{\omega}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\omega}$ is the subchannel of the completely positive map $\mathcal{M}$ labeled by ω, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{M}_{\omega}(\cdot) \coloneqq K_{\omega}\, \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\omega}(\cdot)\, K_{\omega}^{\dagger} \tag{C2}$$

and $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\omega}$ is a deterministic wiring map *that transforms a given assemblage $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \{\sigma_{a|x}\}_{a,x}$ to another assemblage $\{\tilde{\sigma}_{a'|x'}\}_{a',x'}$ with input x' and output a':*

$$[\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\omega}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]_{x'} \coloneqq \tilde{\sigma}_{a'|x'} = \sum_{a,x} P(x|x',\omega)P(a'|x',a,x,\omega)\sigma_{a|x}.$$

To appreciate the motivation of formulating 1W-LOCC in the above manner, we refer the readers to [18]. Moreover, to ease notation, henceforth, we denote $P(x|x',\omega)P(a'|x',a,x,\omega)$ by $Q(a',x',a,x,\omega)$ and define

$$\mathcal{D}_{\omega}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \coloneqq \frac{K_{\omega}\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\omega}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})K_{\omega}^{\dagger}}{\text{tr}(\mathcal{M}_{\omega}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}))} \tag{C3}$$

To prove Theorem C.2, we shall make use of the following Lemma.

Lemma C.3. *For all ω and assemblages $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$,*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\mathcal{D}_{\omega}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \mathbf{F}) \leq \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{F}). \tag{C4}$$

Proof. From the definitions given in Eq. (8) and Eq. (C3), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\mathcal{D}_{\omega}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \mathbf{F}) \\
&\coloneqq \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \sum_{a',x'} \frac{\text{tr}(F_{a'|x'}K_{\omega}\sum_{a,x} Q(a',x',a,x,\omega)\sigma_{a|x}K_{\omega}^{\dagger})}{\omega_s(\mathbf{F})\text{tr}(\mathcal{M}_{\omega}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}))} \\
&= \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \frac{1}{\omega_s(\mathbf{F})} \sum_{a,x} \text{tr}(\check{F}_{a|x}\sigma_{a|x}),
\end{aligned} \tag{C5}$$

where $\check{\mathbf{F}} \coloneqq \{\check{F}_{a|x} \succeq 0\}_{a,x}$ is defined by

$$\check{F}_{a|x} \coloneqq \sum_{a',x'} \frac{Q(a',x',a,x,\omega)K_{\omega}^{\dagger}F_{a'|x'}K_{\omega}}{\text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_{\omega}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}))}. \tag{C6}$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_s(\check{\mathbf{F}}) &:= \sup_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathrm{LHS}} \sum_{a,x} \mathrm{tr}(\check{F}_{a|x}\sigma_{a|x}) \\ &= \sup_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathrm{LHS}} \sum_{a',x'} \mathrm{tr}\left(F_{a'|x'}[\mathcal{D}_\omega(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]_{a'|x'}\right) \\ &\leq \sup_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathrm{LHS}} \sum_{a',x'} \mathrm{tr}(F_{a'|x'}\sigma_{a'|x'}) = \omega_s(\mathbf{F}), \quad \text{(C7)}\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathrm{LHS}$ implies $\mathcal{D}_\omega(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \in \mathrm{LHS}$ [18], and thus $\{\mathcal{D}_\omega(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \mid \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathrm{LHS}\}$ is a subset of LHS. Combining the above results, we have $\sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\mathcal{D}_\omega(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \mathbf{F}) \leq \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \check{\mathbf{F}})$. Since we have $\{\check{\mathbf{F}} \mid \mathbf{F} \succeq 0\} \subseteq \{\mathbf{F} \succeq 0\}$, this means $\sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \check{\mathbf{F}}) \leq \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{F})$, and hence the Lemma. □

To complete the proof of Theorem C.2, it suffices to note, firstly, that when $\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\mathcal{D}_\omega(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) = 0$, the inequality $\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\mathcal{D}_\omega(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) \leq \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ holds trivially, whereas when $\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\mathcal{D}_\omega(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) = \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\mathcal{D}_\omega(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \mathbf{F}) - 1 > 0$, Lemma C.3 implies

$$\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\mathcal{D}_\omega(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) \leq \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{F}) - 1 \leq \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}). \quad \text{(C8)}$$

This means that $\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\mathcal{D}_\omega(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) \leq \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ in general. Since $\mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{M}_\omega(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) \geq 0$ for all ω and $\sum_\omega \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{M}_\omega(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) \leq 1$ for (deterministic) 1W-LOCCs, we must have

$$\sum_\omega \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{M}_\omega(\boldsymbol{\sigma}))\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\mathcal{D}_\omega(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) \leq \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \quad \text{(C9)}$$

which completes the proof of Theorem C.2 by noting that $P(\omega) = \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{M}_\omega(\boldsymbol{\sigma}))$ holds by definition.

2. Proof of quantitative relations between optimal steering fraction and steerable weight

Here, we give a proof of Proposition IV.1.

Proof. Firstly, note that the chain of inequalities holds trivially if $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is unsteerable, since $\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = 0$ in this case. To prove that $\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\mathrm{S})$ holds in general, we thus assume that $\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{F}) - 1 > 0$ and recall from the condition of Proposition IV.1 that $\sigma_{a|x} = [1 - \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]\sigma^\mathrm{US}_{a|x} + \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\sigma^\mathrm{S}_{a|x}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) &= \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \frac{1}{\omega_s(\mathbf{F})} \sum_{a,x} \mathrm{tr}(F_{a|x}\sigma_{a|x}) - 1 \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \frac{1 - \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{\omega_s(\mathbf{F})} \sum_{a,x} \mathrm{tr}(F_{a|x}\sigma^\mathrm{US}_{a|x}) \\ &\quad + \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \frac{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{\omega_s(\mathbf{F})} \sum_{a,x} \mathrm{tr}(F_{a|x}\sigma^\mathrm{S}_{a|x}) - 1 \\ &= [1 - \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})] \left[\sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\mathrm{US}, \mathbf{F}) - 1\right] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \left[\sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\mathrm{S}, \mathbf{F}) - 1\right] \\ &\leq \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\mathrm{S}), \quad \text{(C10)}\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\mathrm{US} \in \mathrm{LHS}$. This proves the first inequality.

To prove the second inequality, $\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\mathrm{S}) \leq \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) + 2\,[1 - \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]$, we note that the triangle inequality implies:

$$\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\mathrm{S}, \mathbf{F}) \leq \Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{F}) + [1 - \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]\,\Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\mathrm{US}, \mathbf{F})$$

Maximizing both sides over all possible $\mathbf{F}$arising from $\mathbf{F} \succeq 0$ and using the definition of optimal steering fraction gives:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\mathrm{S}) + \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \\ &\quad \leq \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) + [1 - \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]\,\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\mathrm{US}) + 2 - \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{W}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\mathrm{US}) = 0$ by definition, simplifying the above inequality therefore leads to the desired inequality and completes the proof. □

3. Proof of quantitative relations between optimal steering fraction and steerable robustness

Here, we give a proof of Proposition IV.2, which proceeds analogously with the proof of Proposition IV.1.

Proof. Again, we focus on the nontrivial scenario where $\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{F}) - 1 > 0$. To prove $\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\,[\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) + 2]$, we note from the condition of the proposition $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\mathrm{US} = \frac{1}{1+\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}\boldsymbol{\sigma} + \frac{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{1+\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, the definition of $\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}$, Γ_s, and the triangle inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) &\leq [1 + \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})] \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\mathrm{US}, \mathbf{F}) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \sup_{\mathbf{F}\succeq 0} \Gamma_s(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}, \mathbf{F}) - 1 \\ &\leq [1 + \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]\,\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\mathrm{US}) + \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) + 2\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \\ &= \mathcal{S}_\mathrm{R}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\,[\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{O}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) + 2]\,,\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\mathrm{US} \in \mathrm{LHS}$.

To show the other inequality, we note that:

$$\Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma},\mathbf{F}) + [1+\mathcal{S}_{\rm R}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]\,\Gamma_s(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\rm US},\mathbf{F}) = \mathcal{S}_{\rm R}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\Gamma_s(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\mathbf{F})$$

Rearranging the term, taking supremum over $\mathbf{F} \succeq 0$ on both sides, and noting that $\mathcal{S}_{\rm O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\rm US}) = 0$, we thus obtain the desired inequality $\mathcal{S}_{\rm R}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\mathcal{S}_{\rm O}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) - 2 \leq \mathcal{S}_{\rm O}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$. □

[1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
[2] J. S. Bell, Physics **1**, 195 (1964).
[3] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).
[4] N. Brunner, D. Cavalcanti, S. Pironio, and S. Wehner, Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 419 (2014).
[5] E. Schrodinger, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **31**, 555 (1935); **32**, 446 (1936).
[6] H. M. Wiseman, S. J. Jones, and A. C. Doherty, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 140402 (2007); Phys. Rev. A **76**, 052116 (2007).
[7] M. T. Quintino, T. Vértesi, D. Cavalcanti, R. Augusiak, M. Demianowicz, A. Acín, and N. Brunner, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 032107 (2015).
[8] C. Branciard, E. G. Cavalcanti, S. P. Walborn, V. Scarani, and H. M. Wiseman, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 010301(R) (2012).
[9] M. Piani and J. Watrous, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 060404 (2015).
[10] P. Girdhar and E. G. Cavalcanti, arXiv:1601.01703 (2016).
[11] M. M. Taddei, R. V. Nery, and L. Aolita, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 032106 (2016).
[12] J. Bowles, F. Hirsch, M. T. Quintino, and N. Brunner, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 022121 (2016).
[13] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).
[14] J. Barrett, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 042302 (2002).
[15] M. L. Almeida, S. Pironio, J. Barrett, G. Toth, and A. Acín, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 040403 (2007).
[16] C. Palazuelos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 190401 (2012).
[17] D. Cavalcanti, A. Acín, N. Brunner, and T. Vértesi, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 042104 (2013).
[18] R. Gallego and L. Aolita, Phys. Rev. X **5**, 041008 (2015).
[19] P. Skrzypczyk, M. Navascués, and D. Cavalcanti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 180404 (2014).
[20] R. F. Werner and M. M. Wolf, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 032112 (2001).
[21] H. Buhrman, O. Regev, G. Scarpa, and R. de Wolf, in 26th IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity (CCC 11), San Diego, 2011 (IEEE, Piscataway, NJ, 2011), pp.157-166.
[22] M. F. Pusey, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 032313 (2013).
[23] E. G. Cavalcanti, S. J. Jones, H. M. Wiseman, and M. D. Reid, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 032112 (2009).
[24] Z. Yin, M. Marciniak, and M. Horodecki, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **48**, 135303 (2015).
[25] J. Bowles, T. Vértesi, M. T. Quintino, and N. Brunner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 200402 (2014).
[26] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1888 (1999).
[27] S. Albeverio, S-M. Fei, and W-L. Yang, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 012301 (2002).
[28] M. Horodecki and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 4206 (1999).
[29] R. Jozsa, J. Mod. Opt. **41**, 2315 (1994).
[30] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 772 (1996).
[31] M. Marciniak, A. Rutkowski, Z. Yin, M. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 170401 (2015).
[32] W. K. Wootters and B. D. Fields, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **191**, 363 (1989).
[33] C. Palazuelos, J. Funct. Anal. **267**, 1959 (2014).
[34] A. Acín, N. Gisin, and B. Toner, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 062105 (2006)
[35] T. Vértesi, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 032112 (2008).
[36] A. C. S. Costa and R. M. Angelo, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 020103(R) (2016).
[37] Y.-C. Liang and A. C. Doherty, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 052116 (2006).
[38] S. A. Khot and N. K. Vishnoi, in Proceedings 46th FOCS, Pittsburgh, pp. 53-62 (2005).
[39] R. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **200**, 340 (1995).
[40] Y.-C. Liang and A. C. Doherty, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 042103 (2007).
[41] F. Hirsch, M. T. Quintino, T. Vértesi, M. F. Pusey, and N. Brunner, arXiv:1512.00262 (2015); D. Cavalcanti, L. Guerini, R. Rabelo, and P. Skrzypczyk, arXiv:1512.00277 (2015).
[42] M. T. Quintino *et al.* (in preparation).
[43] D. Collins, N. Gisin, N. Linden, S. Massar and S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 040404 (2002).
[44] S. R. Finch, *Mathematical Constants* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2003), p.235.
[45] J. L. Krivine, Adv. Math. **31**, 16 (1979).